

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/613,563	07/02/2003	Zongwen Liao	T-1239 5482		
802	7590 05/09/200		EXAMINER		
DELLETT AND WALTERS			SAYALA, CHHAYA D		
P. O. BOX 27 PORTLAND	786 , OR 97208-2786	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1761		

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				T					
		Applica	ation No.	Applicant(s)					
	And Anthrop Comment	10/613	3,563	LIAO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary		Examir	ner	Art Unit					
		C. SAY		1761					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) do period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, reply received by the Office later than three months after need patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ication. days, a reply within the sory period will apply and, by statute, cause the a	o event, however, may a reply be tim statutory minimum of thirty (30) days d will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from application to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on							
2a) <u></u> ☐	☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.								
3)[3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	ion of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the app	olication.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are		consideration.	•					
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•	·					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			•					
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	n and/or election	n requirement.						
Applicati	ion Papers								
9)[The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a))□ accepted or	b) ☐ objected to by the F	Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objectio	n to the drawing(s	s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	•	•	` '					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by	y the Examiner.	Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: 1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.									
	2. Certified copies of the priority doc			on No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of t		• •						
	application from the International			-					
* S	See the attached detailed Office action for	or a list of the ce	ertified copies not receive	d.					
Attachment	` '								
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-	-948)	4)	(PTO-413) ite					
3) 🔲 Inforn	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTC er No(s)/Mail Date			atent Application (PTO-152)					

Application/Control Number: 10/613,563

Art Unit: 1761

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In the claims, "acts" should be changed to - - steps- - .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fischbein et al. (US Patent 5360465).

The patent teaches grinding ammonium phosphate to a fine powder, prewetted, and mixing it with lignosulfonate. The mixture is then granulated, dried and ground to the required size. See col. 3, lines 15+. Note the concentration of lignosulfonate at col. 4, lines 26.

Art Unit: 1761

3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Detroit (US Patent 4846871 or 5041153).

Detroit teaches grinding ammonium phosphate and adding up to 5 wt% lignosulfonate to the fertilizer solution and then prilling the mixture. See col. 3, lines 10-70 in '153. (The disclosure of '871 is similar).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buchholz et al. (US Patent 5360465).

The patentees teach a solution of lignosulfonate upto 5 wt% sprayed onto very fine particles of ammonium phosphate. The patent does not teach grinding the mixture and drying. However such a step would have been obvious to any routineer to grind a fertilizer to the required size and to dry the product for ease of storage and shipping. See col. 3, lines 1-5, claims 1-7 and col. 4, lines 55+.

5. Claims 1, 3, 10, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CN 1163250.

Application/Control Number: 10/613,563

Art Unit: 1761

The zeolite is crushed and compounded with ammonium phosphate and pelletized. It is disclosed as a fertilizer.

6. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohwer US Pub. 2004/0099027 in view of Young (US Patent 3354096), RU 2165912 and Berry et al. (US Patent 4695387).

The publication teaches that to a slurry of zeolite (10%), ammonium phosphate solution is added and dried, see page 2, paragraph [0021] and claims. The patent does not teach adding the phosphate as a powder or that the slurry is granulated.

Young teaches that effective phosphate binding is obtained, at its strongest, at low pH values, between about 3.5 and 6.0 (see col. 4, lines 30-35). The patent teaches a zeolite slurry with ammonium phosphate. The wet mixture is then dried and pelleted (see col. 3, lines 57-62).

RU 2165912 teaches preparing granulating nitrogen phosphorus fertilizer, such as ammonium phosphate by neutralizing ammonia and phosphoric acid with sulfuric acid and applying this to zeolite. The mixture is dried and granulated.

Berry et al. teach that a pH between 4 and 6 is an ideal range of operation for the zeolite adsorbent (see col. 3, lines 48-50).

To form a slurry from powdered ammonium phosphate would have been an obvious expedient because solutions and slurries are generally formed from solids or powders. To incorporate sulfuric acid with the zeolite would also have been obvious

Application/Control Number: 10/613,563 Page 5

Art Unit: 1761

because, it was generally well known in the art at the time the invention was made that a low pH was very effective for zeolite-phosphate binding and the addition of sulfuric acid was also known. Amounts would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art from those shown by the references. See Rohwer et al. in particular.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. SAYALA whose telephone number is 571-272-1405.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

C. SATALA
Primary Examiner

Group 1700.

Application/Control Number: 10/613,563

Art Unit: 1761

Page 6